

planning effort for the future and that [the proposed casino could] apparently be accommodated with minimal overall impact, just as any other development of this size.” The attachments to Redner’s letter included the results of the Dec. 3, 1992, referendum in which 51.1 percent of voters supported allowing an Indian casino at the Hudson dog track.

The Board of Supervisors of St. Croix County – the county containing the site of the proposed facility – wrote a letter on April 15, 1994, to the MAO noting that BIA had failed to provide complete information about the size of the proposed operation to permit a complete impact analysis. Based on what is described as limited information, the Board stated that it “[could] not conclusively make any findings on whether or not the proposed gaming establishment [would] be detrimental to the surrounding community.”⁷⁸

The Town of Troy, which borders the Hudson dog track on three sides, also complained about the lack of information about the size of the casino on which to base its response to the BIA consultation letter. Nonetheless, in its March 14, 1994, letter, the Town raised concerns about the impact of a casino on jobs, traffic, housing and the quality of life, without quantifying these impacts.

b. Responses by Local Residents and Activists

Although the MAO did not send solicitation letters to individual residents or elected officials, it did receive some correspondence from them. On June 10, 1994, Nancy Bieraugel, a Hudson resident active in several local issues, provided the MAO with a petition opposing the casino in Hudson on which she and other volunteers obtained 3,100 signatures of citizens of

⁷⁸Letter from Richard Peterson to Robert Jaeger, April 15, 1994.